



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,047	12/08/2005	Kyoichi Watanabe	040302-0533	8180
22428	7590	12/24/2009	EXAMINER	
FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP			ECHELMEYER, ALIX ELIZABETH	
SUITE 500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3000 K STREET NW			1795	
WASHINGTON, DC 20007			MAIL DATE	
			12/24/2009	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/560,047	WATANABE ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Alix Elizabeth Echelmeyer	<b>Art Unit</b> 1795

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 16-29 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/25/07, 3/12/07, 12/05/05

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election of claims 1-15 in the reply filed on August 26, 2009 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
2. Claims 1-15 are rejected for the reasons given below.

***Claim Interpretation***

3. Claims 5 and 6 include product by process limitations drawn to the method of forming the electrode. The product-by-process limitations are not given patentable weight since the courts have held that patentability is based on a product itself, even if the prior art product is made by a different process (see In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964, (CAFC 1985), In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972), and In re Marosi, 218 USPQ 289, 292-293 (CAFC 1983)). MPEP 2113.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noh et al. (US 2004/0197667) in view of Urso et al. (US 2004/0115522)

Noh et al. teach an electrode for a battery containing an active material, either lithium nickel oxide or lithium manganese oxide for the cathode and carbon for the anode ([0023], [0046]).

The electrode, disposed on the current collector, is taught to be 147  $\mu\text{m}$  for the cathode and 178  $\mu\text{m}$  for the anode ([0152]).

With regard to claims 2 and 3, Noh et al. teach electrode tabs but fails to teach that the tabs are in a region where the electrode layer is not on the collector ([0032]). The skilled artisan would easily recognize that the tabs are connected to the current collector and not to the electrode layer, thus necessitating of the current collector where no electrode layer is disposed, since the current collector functions to remove electricity from the cell and provide it to the load through the tab.

As for claim 11, the battery of Noh et al. is a lithium secondary battery (abstract).

With regard to claims 12 and 13, it is clear from Figure 1 that multiple batteries are assembled.

As for claims 14 and 15, the skilled artisan would easily recognize the utility of the battery of Noh et al. in a vehicle. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a battery to a vehicle.

Noh et al. fail to teach the maximum thickness of the collector and electrode layer is not more than 105% of a minimum thickness of the collector and electrode layer.

Urso et al. teach a battery electrode that has active material in a uniform thickness on the current collector ([0002]). The uniform thickness is desired since it leads to improved electrical performance.

One having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made could have applied the teachings of Urso et al. to a uniform thickness to the electrode of Noh et al. and the results would have been predictable. MPEP 2141 III.

As for the specifics of claims 1, 2, 4, and 9, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the thickness of the electrode of Noh et al. as uniform as possible, since that would lead to improved electrical performance such as taught by Urso et al. It has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art.

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noh in view of Urso et al. as applied to claim 9 above and in further view of Wensley et al. (US 2004/0253520).

The teachings of Noh et al. and Urso et al. as discussed above are incorporated herein.

Noh et al. in view of Urso et al. fail to teach a packing material including a polymer metal composite film.

Wensley et al. teach a metal plastic laminate case for a lithium battery, further teaching that such a case can provide improvements in weight and thickness over other case materials ([0009]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention as made to provide a metal plastic laminate case such as the one of Wensley et al. for the battery of Noh et al. in view of Urso et al.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alix Elizabeth Echelmeyer whose telephone number is (571)272-1101. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alix Elizabeth Echelmeyer  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1795

/Dah-Wei D. Yuan/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795